

financial aid have enabled colleges and universities to raise their tuition, confident that Federal loan subsidies will help cushion the increase.”

From 1939–1964, Federal student aid—mainly the GI bill—averaged just 2.5 percent of university spending.

From 2002–2014, Federal student loan aid spending averaged a whopping 33 percent of university spending.

Several things, Mr. Speaker, could and should be done to start helping solve this problem.

First, Federal and State legislators, parents, and even students themselves should speak out against tuition increases higher than the rate of inflation.

Secondly, colleges and universities that hold these increases down, or hopefully someday even lower their costs, should be given priority and rewarded in Federal and State grants and appropriations.

Third, the Congress and State legislatures should hold hearings that feature people who have been victimized by taking on heavy student loan debts at the start of their careers.

Fourth, every college or university that receives Federal money—99.9 percent—should be required to give financial counseling or at least some type of simple, easy-to-understand document to every person receiving a student loan warning about potential problems.

□ 1045

Lastly, but most important of all, Federal and State governments should give incentives to schools that require professors to teach classes rather than writing for obscure journals or doing esoteric research that produces no tangible results.

Too many professors have lost their desire to teach. They seem to think 6 hours a week is heavy load. The result is that too many students cannot get the classes they need to graduate, and it is now taking 5 or 6 years to get a 4-year degree.

This is a very serious, fast-growing problem, Mr. Speaker, that needs major reforms sooner rather than later.

PRIORITIZING ONLINE THREAT ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, imagine waking up every morning with the dread that you will face hundreds of violent threats as soon as you get to work.

Imagine that, while you are in your office, people threaten to sexually assault you, and they know where you live, when you are home, and who your family members are. Maybe they even show you the weapon they will use in the future to harm you. We would never tolerate this in our offices, but this is a daily reality for women online.

Right now, millions of women and girls are online, navigating their personal and professional lives; yet women will be targeted with the most severe types of online threats and harassment at a rate 27 times higher than that of men. Although these threats occur online, there is nothing virtual about their devastating impacts on women's lives.

Meet Jessica Valenti, a journalist who founded a site that features topics like women in the media, women's health, and LGBT rights. The price Jessica pays for creating this forum and expressing a feminist point of view on the Internet is an unrelenting barrage of rape and death threats.

After threats forced her to leave her home, to change her bank accounts, and to change her phone number, she contacted the FBI. The FBI advised her to never walk outside by herself and to leave her home until the threats blow over. The threats continue today, 4 years later.

In Pennsylvania, a woman described her terror after her abuser announced on Facebook that he planned to tie her up, put her in a trunk, pull out her teeth one by one, and then her nails, chop her into pieces, but keep her alive long enough to feel the pain.

Then there is the story of my constituent, Brianna Wu, a video game developer who had to flee her home with her family in the middle of the night after specific threats to rape and to kill her and her husband. Her online attackers released her home address and described in graphic detail the acts of violence they were planning.

Another woman moved nine times in an 18-month period out of fear of online threats. She moved across the country and changed her job four times just to stay safe.

None of the people who made these threats has been prosecuted, and most of the examples I have of online threats that women, including myself, have received are too vile and obscene to share on the House floor. In Jessica Valenti's words: “When people say you should be raped and killed for years on end, it takes a toll on your soul.”

For Jessica and Brianna and other victims of severe threats online, there are huge financial and professional impacts. They have lost work opportunities and have spent money on legal advice, protective services, and temporary housing.

They have had to pay to have their personal information scrubbed from Web sites. This is a significant price to pay just to remain an active participant of an online economy.

What has been our response? In a 3-year period, of an estimated 2.5 million cyber stalking cases, only 10 were federally prosecuted. A judge in Massachusetts recently told one victim who works in technology and has suffered terrifying threats from an ex-boyfriend to simply go offline.

When I asked the FBI about the investigation and prosecution of online

violence against women, they told me it is not a priority. By failing to address the realities of changing technology and a changing economy, we are failing these women.

It is not okay to call this an Internet problem. It is not okay to say to women that this is just the way things are. It is not okay to tell women to change their behavior, to withhold their opinions, and to stay off the Internet altogether, just to avoid severe threats.

For decades, women who have been victims of sexual assault and abuse have been told they have provoked their abusers by what they wore or what they have said. We have worked hard to change that culture; yet, by not taking these cases seriously, we send a clear message that, when women express opinions online, they are asking for it.

That is why I am calling on the Department of Justice to enforce the laws that are already on the books and take these investigations and prosecutions seriously. The Prioritizing Online Threat Enforcement Act would give the Department of Justice and the FBI the resources and the mandate to investigate and enforce the Federal laws on cyber threats.

It is not Congress' job to police the Internet, but we have a responsibility to make sure that women are able to fully participate in our economy. I urge my colleagues to support this crucial bill.

Let's keep the Internet open and safe for all voices.

FUNDING THE STRATOSPHERIC OBSERVATORY FOR INFRARED ASTRONOMY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the House Appropriations Committee for fully funding the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, SOFIA, program.

The SOFIA program is something that is stationed in my district. It is a 747 airplane with a 100-inch telescope in the back. Some people ask why we would need this or why this is something that NASA is so excited about. It is because we have certain programs that are in the atmosphere, and on the ground today, many of them have restrictions, but SOFIA doesn't. SOFIA does things that other telescopes just can't do.

First, it flies at 40,000 feet, so it gets above the water vapor. That is something that we just can't do from the ground. We can't do that type of science, those observations—we just can't do it—yet SOFIA does something that many other telescopes can't do.

It does something that the Hubble can't do. It does something that our beloved James Webb Space Telescope, which is going to be launched in the next couple of years, cannot do. It

lands, and we can upgrade it. If there is something new in 2015, we can put it on SOFIA. SOFIA can take off. We can do our projects, and we can do our experiments. It can land. If we have something new in 2016, we can do the same thing and so on and so forth.

For the next 20 years, we will be flying SOFIA if this Congress continues to fund it. Last year, SOFIA was on the chopping block, and without the good leadership of our majority leader, it might have gone away.

What I wanted to bring to everyone's attention is, if we are going to fund NASA, if we are going to fund projects for our new generation, if we are going to explore, if we are going to do all of the things that make America great and that make America the exploration country that we have been for the last 100-plus years, then we have to invest a little bit.

When the administration threatened to shut down SOFIA in fiscal year 2015, Congress showed strong support to make sure that SOFIA would continue; but, as we move forward, we understand what these types of projects bring.

As I look into the crowd, I see an awful lot of young folks who have either visited Washington, D.C., or they are on a tour, or they are doing something. That is what SOFIA brings. Every year, we put fifth and sixth and seventh grade teachers in SOFIA for a 9- or 10-hour mission.

They get to work with NASA. They get to work with scientists from America and from Germany because this is a joint project, and they get to see what projects and what experiments NASA is doing. They also get to work with NASA hand in hand.

They get to bring that back to the classroom, and they get to teach their fifth through seventh grade students about astronomy, about learning, about new planets, about new stars, about dying stars, about new solar systems. They take that at a practical level not just what is in the book, but what they learn, what they see, and what they do with NASA itself.

Also, I greatly appreciate the language that the committee included in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill, which reaffirms our support for SOFIA and rejects NASA's plan to conduct a senior review of the mission at such a premature stage.

If we are going to look at what SOFIA and other projects from NASA do, we have to allow them to bring us some real data. That data takes time. If we are going to do that on a 1- or 2-year status and then, maybe, cancel a project, then all of the money that we have injected into this project will be for naught.

Given that SOFIA achieved full operating status just this last year, in 2014, it has been designed for a lifespan of up to, like I said, 20 years. A senior review should not be at a 2-year stand, but it

should go to a 5- or an 8-year stand so that we can collect the data and make sure that this program is worth the money the taxpayers spend on it.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because they have supported this project just like they have supported many projects for NASA and for our experiment community.

Without the support from both sides of the aisle, it is really going to be difficult for America to continue to be the leader in space exploration and exploration abroad.

IMPROVING TREATMENT OF U.S. TERRITORIES UNDER FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAMS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a comprehensive bill to improve the treatment of Puerto Rico and the other territories under Medicaid, traditional Medicare, and Medicare Advantage.

This is the first time that a Member of Congress has filed legislation to address the range of challenges that patients, physicians, hospitals, and insurance providers in the territories face as a result of the unequal treatment the territories receive under Federal health programs.

The bill serves as a blueprint for policymakers in identifying the various problems that exist under current Federal law and in proposing fair, realistic, and technically precise solutions to each problem.

Based on my conversations with congressional leaders and officials in the Obama administration, I believe there is bipartisan recognition that Federal health laws do not do justice to American citizens living in the territories.

I recognize that Republicans and Democrats have different opinions regarding the virtues of the Affordable Care Act, but it is my hope that policymakers can agree that it is in the national interest to take concrete steps to eliminate or reduce the numerous disparities that the territories confront under Medicaid and Medicare. These inequalities were enshrined in law long before 2010 and remain in place today.

Stated simply, if the will exists among officials in the legislative and executive branches to improve the treatment of the territories under Federal health programs, as I believe it does, then my bill provides a way forward. After today, no Federal policymaker can say: I want to help, but I don't know how.

Rather than summarizing the bill's 16 sections, I will highlight the provisions relating to Medicaid, the program for low-income individuals, which is jointly funded by the Federal Government and each State or territory government.

In the States, there is no limit on Federal funding for Medicaid as long as

the State provides its share of matching funds. The Federal contribution, known as an FMAP, can range from 50 percent for the wealthiest States to over 80 percent for the poorest States.

By contrast, the funding that the Federal Government provides for Medicaid in each territory is capped. When I took office in 2009, Puerto Rico's cap was only \$260 million a year, and the Federal Government was covering less than 20 percent of the cost of the territory's Medicaid Program.

During my tenure, the Federal Government has increased Medicaid funding for the territories, but that funding remains capped. Especially in the case of Puerto Rico, it is still profoundly inequitable. Most problematic, this funding expires in 2019, and in Puerto Rico, it will be depleted well before then.

This funding cliff is unique to the territories. The bill I am filing today would avert this cliff and provide a more stable and equitable level of Medicaid funding for the territories. Starting in fiscal year 2017, the bill would provide the territories with State-like treatment within well-defined parameters.

□ 1100

Specifically, each territory's Medicaid program could cover individuals whose family income is at or below the Federal poverty level. As long as a territory covers individuals within these income limits, the Federal Government would fund the territory's Medicaid program as if it were a State Medicaid program. The annual funding caps would be eliminated, and each territory would receive an FMAP based on its per capita income. However, the limiting principle is that if a territory wants to cover individuals earning above the Federal poverty level, it will generally be required to use territory dollars, not Federal dollars.

The rationale behind this new proposal is simple. Residents of the territories are American citizens. At the very least, the Federal Government should provide each territory with the funding necessary to provide health coverage to their residents who live at or below the Federal poverty level. Anything less is unacceptable from a moral and public policy standpoint.

I invite my colleagues to support this comprehensive bill and to work with me to enact its provisions into law.

RECOGNIZING JESSE HILL AND DELAWARE VALLEY VIETNAM VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, for decades Vietnam veteran and Levittown, Bucks County, resident Jesse Hill has dedicated himself to preserving the memory of those lost in Vietnam and bringing awareness to those still missing.